

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 730

CS 503 104

AUTHOR Kellstedt, Lyman A.
TITLE The Mass Media and Political Behavior: Television Viewing Habits and Vote Turnout.
PUB DATE May 80
NOTE 27p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (30th, Acapulco, Mexico, May 18-23, 1980).
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Correlation: Mass Media: *Media Research: *Programming (Broadcast): *Television Viewing: *Voting
IDENTIFIERS *Media Effects

ABSTRACT

Data from a 1976 election study were used to compare the effects of different types of television watching (daytime, evening entertainment, news, campaign programming, presidential debates) on voter turnout and to compare these effects with those of other media (radio, magazines, newspapers). After controlling for the effects of the traditional variables used to explain voter turnout (such as education, efficacy, and the salience of politics), it was found that television viewing habits had an independent effect on rates of turnout. The effects varied depending on the particular television viewing habit: campaign/debate watching had a very positive effect; the effects of news watching were minimally positive; and, as expected, the effects of entertainment watching were negative (increased entertainment viewing correlated with lower voter turnout). As the frequency of attention to newspapers, radio, and magazines went up, turnout rose, with the greatest increases occurring for newspaper reading. Those subjects who relied on newspapers as their source of news voted at greater rates than those who relied on television. (RL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED193730

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE MASS MEDIA AND POLITICAL BEHAVIOR: TELEVISION VIEWING
HABITS AND VOTE TURNOUT

Lyman A. Kellstedt--University of Illinois, Chicago Circle

Paper presented at the XXth International Conference on Communication of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico, May 18-23, 1980.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lyman A. Kellstedt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

C5503104

In 1980 in the major advanced technological systems of the world, it is almost impossible to conceive of life without television. The "tube," as they say, is omnipresent. A whole generation has been raised in families where the television set was a constant companion. Can the reader imagine the George Gallup Organization repeating in 1980 two questions that were asked seriously of a sample of Americans in 1945: "Do you know what television is? Have you ever seen a television set in operation?" (Comstock, et. al., p. 1)

The pervasive quality of television in American society is illustrated by the fact that the average home has the set turned on approximately seven hours each day. (Comstock, p. 85) Something that much a part of our everyday lives must be having some effects. The assumption is often made that the effects are pernicious: that it leads to violence, contributes to family dissolution, narrows attention spans, contributes to lower reading scores, that it distorts reality. An award winning documentary, A Death in the Family, produced by WCCO Television in Minneapolis, showed that people exhibited definite withdrawal symptoms (nervousness, anxiety, etc.) when deprived of television for a one month period. The withdrawal appeared almost as difficult as that of the narcotics addict deprived of his favorite drug.

Despite the omnipresence of television, there is variation in viewing habits among groups of Americans. For example, in 1976 in families where the head of household had less than one year of college education, the average viewing time per day was 7 hours; while for families whose head had at least one year of college or more, the average dropouts 6.39 hours (Comstock, et. al., p. 89). Families with incomes under \$10,000 watched substantially more television than those making more than \$15,000 (Comstock, et. al., p. 94). There are age group variations as well: adult women (18 years of age and older) and men over 50 years of age watched more than the national average (Comstock,

et. al., p. 92). In addition, black households watched more television than did whites (Comstock, et. al., p. 125). In summary, heavy television viewers were found disproportionately among the minimally educated, low income, women, older male, and black segments of the population.

Despite the important role of television in the lives of Americans, students of political behavior have been surprisingly slow in attempting to assess its effects. Part of the reason for this may be that the most widely used data resource for students of American electoral behavior, the major election studies conducted since 1952 by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan, have contained a paucity of questions on the mass media in general and even fewer on television. As we shall see, the 1976 Michigan voting study was an exception to this pattern. It contained a series of questions on mass media consumption including a broader set of items concerning television viewing habits.

Our particular concern is to compare the effects of different types of television watching (daytime, evening entertainment, the news, campaign programming, presidential debates) on turnout and to compare these effects with those of other media (radio, magazines, newspapers). Finally, we hope to compare the impact of television and the other media with variables that have been identified in previous studies as affecting turnout (education, age, party identification, interest in politics, efficacy, citizen duty).

Review of Literature

The first systematic review of the variables that affect voting turnout was provided by The American Voter (Campbell, et. al., pp. 89-115). Three types of attitudinal variables were identified that affected rates of turnout:

- 1) partisan identification--people with strong attachments to their party were more likely to vote than those with weak attachments or none at all;
- 2) political involvement or salience--citizens who cared about the outcome of the election, were interested in the campaign, and felt efficacious politically were more likely to vote than people who did not have these characteristics;
- 3) citizen duty--those who felt an obligation to vote were more likely to vote than those who did not feel this obligation. When all of these variables (in points 1), 2) and 3) above) were combined into the index of "political involvement," the measures in combination did an excellent job in predicting turnout (Campbell, et. al., p. 107).

Certain other variables were shown to affect turnout as well: sex, race, region of residence, length of residence in the community, age, education, income, and employment status. Turnout was higher for males, whites, non-Southerners, long term community residents, the middle aged, highly educated, wealthy, and employed in high status jobs (see Asher, p. 50, for recent data on these variables).

Concern for the role of the media in elections has an even longer history. The early Columbia studies, particularly The People's Choice, began with the assumption that the media played a major role in vote decisions. The focus of the research, however, was not on vote turnout. Kraus and Davis (1976, p. 52), in their review of the "classic" voting studies done at Columbia and Michigan, conclude that the "mass media, particularly television, have little direct effect on political behavior." However, the authors caution that this conclusion was formulated in an era when the number of television sets was only one-quarter

what they were in the mid 1970s. In a recent paper that cites several studies, Gant (1979, p. 4) concludes that: "The influence of television usage on voter turnout has been shown to be either weak or nonexistent." In a study using data from the 1968 election study conducted by Michigan, Prisuta (1973) concludes that the use of the newspaper as a source of political information was significantly related to voter turnout, while television viewership was not. In contrast, Blumler and McLeod (1974) in their study of the 1970 British election found that campaign viewing did affect turnout among young voters even when variables like socioeconomic status were used as controls. Thus, of the studies cited, only the Blumler and McLeod research makes a case for the importance of television as a factor affecting vote turnout.

We plan to reexamine the television impact with data from the 1976 election study conducted at Michigan. The test of television effects on voter turnout should be a better one than Prisuta was able to achieve with the 1968 data for a number of reasons:

- 1) Television usage grew significantly between 1968 and 1976 (Comstock, et.al., pp. 92-3);

- 2) The Michigan data set had many more media questions included in the latter year, giving us the opportunity to compare the effects of various types of television viewing (entertainment, news, political campaigning, debates) on vote turnout.

Data Analysis

In this section we will attempt to assess the impact of mass media variables, and in particular television, on voting turnout in the 1976 presidential election.¹ As noted above, the 1976 study contained more mass media variables than in previous studies, although it still fell far short of an ideal set of questions to tap the viewing habits of Americans. In addition to a question that had been asked previously about following the campaign on television, the 1976 questionnaire included items about presidential and vice-presidential candidate debate watching, news watching (both national and local), as well as daytime and evening entertainment watching.

In Table 1 we examine the frequency distributions for the 1976 media variables. Note that over half the sample do not follow the political campaign via the radio or magazines as compared with around one-quarter of the electorate who do not follow the election in the newspapers and only 11 percent who do not follow the campaign on television. By 1976, radio had diminished to a point where its importance as a campaign informer was no greater than that of magazines. Television is the predominant source of campaign information followed by newspapers. And as the final item in the table demonstrates, television is much more relied upon for political news than is the newspaper. This latter finding is supported by data from other sources (Roper). Data in Table 1 support the conclusion that both early evening network and late evening local news programs are watched frequently by Americans and that the presidential debates were watched by large numbers of people in 1976. Daytime and evening entertainment are watched less frequently, although the latter item did not include all prime time evening shows but asked about those concerning crime and violence. The picture that emerges in Table 1

1. Data for this analysis were provided through the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research whose help is gratefully acknowledged. The Consortium, of course, is not responsible for the content of this paper.

is one of an American public that gets much campaign and political information from the newspapers but which relies on television for the bulk of its information about politics.

In Table 2 we examine the relationships between the media variables and voting turnout in the 1976 election. The following generalizations describe the data in the table:

- 1) As the frequency of attention to newspapers, radio and magazines goes up, turnout rises. Increases are greatest for newspaper reading.
- 2) As campaign and TV debate watching increases, turnout increases dramatically.
- 3) There is a slight increase in turnout as news watching increases in frequency.
- 4) In contrast, as entertainment watching increases, turnout decreases to some extent, particularly for daytime viewers.
- 5) Those who rely on newspapers as the source of news vote at greater rates than those who rely on television.

If we focus on the television items in Table 2, we note that those who do not watch entertainment shows have turnout rates in the area of 75 percent. This compares with figures in the low 60 percent range for those who do not watch news and rates in the 40 percent range for those do not watch the debates or the political campaign on TV. If we examine the "regular" watchers of the various types of television viewing, the pattern is exactly the opposite to that described above. Entertainment watchers have low rates of turnout; news watchers have moderate levels; and those who watch the campaign and debates have high rates of turnout. In terms of the explicitly political content of these types of programming, these findings are understandable: political content is pretty much non-existent in entertainment

programming. Even the news has a great deal of non-political, human interest type of content. We suspect that for at least some viewers the news may be tuned in frequently but psychologically the content is "tuned out." In particular, many local news watchers may be interested in the weather or sports and not "hard news" content. Others may have the news on regularly because the television is turned on so much of the time. The campaigns and debates, in contrast, are totally political. Individuals may "tune out" much of what they see and hear on these programs as well, but the task is somewhat more difficult than with the news. Anything cognized will be "political." As noted above, such is not the case with the news. Prisuta has argued that the different media (newspapers, television, etc.) have differential impact on voting turnout. What we have demonstrated in Table 2 is that there is differential impact within television itself depending on the type of program watched. Whether the relationships are spurious will be determined at a later point in the paper.

The pattern of responses in Table 2 suggests combining a number of the media items into a smaller number of indices. As a result, we created four indices which we use throughout the remainder of the analysis: 1) other media, which combines radio, magazine and newspaper frequencies; 2) campaign and debate watching; 3) television news; and 4) entertainment. In Table 3, we examine the relationships of these indices and vote turnout. As suggested by the preceding bivariate analysis, relationships are strongest for the other media and campaign/debate indices with turnout increasing as the frequency of attention to these media increases. This finding is in contrast to that of Prisuta who found high turnout related to newspaper reading but not to television watching. We find that high rates of a certain type of

television viewing, campaign/debate watching, is also related to high turnout. Turnout is only moderately related to television news watching and is negatively related to the frequency of entertainment watching. As television entertainment watching increases, turnout decreases.

Are these relationships spurious? Before attempting to answer this question, we need to examine the relationships between other variables and vote turnout. We make use of variables that numerous studies have identified as affecting turnout. A whole series of relationships are presented in Appendix A. We can summarize these relationships as follows; turnout is higher for:

- 1) Males than females;
- 2) Whites than for blacks;
- 3) the middle aged than for the young and the old;
- 4) those with college educations when compared with high school graduates and those with less than a high school diploma;
- 5) the middle class as opposed to the working-class;
- 6) high income as opposed to lower income groups;
- 7) those who follow public affairs closely in contrast to those who do not;
- 8) strong party identifiers as compared to weak identifiers and Independents;
- 9) those who care who wins the election as opposed to those who do not;
- 10) those who are very much interested in the campaign compared with those who are not much interested;
- 11) those who feel a strong obligation to vote regardless of circumstances as opposed to those who do not;
- 12) the efficacious as opposed to the non-efficacious;
- 13) those who perceive government as responsive to the citizenry in contrast to those who do not;

14) those who feel a sense of trust in other people as opposed to the more distrustful.

None of these findings is surprising given prior literature (cf. Asher, Flanigan and Zingale, and Milbrath and Goel).

In Table 4, we examine the relationships between the various media indices, plus the media concentration item, and turnout controlling for the effects of certain of the variables noted above: concern about the outcome of the election, a political efficacy item, a citizen duty item, a personal trust variable, as well as age and education. (The basic patterns that emerge hold for the other variables in Appendix A that are not included in Table 4.) Before examining specifics the main conclusion to be drawn from the data presented in Table 4 is that the media/turnout relationships shown in Table 3 are not spurious when controls are instituted. Despite controlling for variables that impact on turnout, as demonstrated in previous research and as found in the 1976 data (see Appendix A), the media variables affect turnout as shown in Table 3: respondents who rank high in the non-television media vote at very high rates as do the high campaign/debate watchers; high news watchers vote at more moderate rates; and high entertainment watchers have low rates of turnout.

Let us examine each of the control variables in turn. In previous research, concern with the outcome of the election has been shown to affect turnout rates (Campbell, et. al., pp. 103-104). In Table 4, we see that concern has the same effect regardless of media variable. Nonetheless, the media effect is not washed out by controlling for concern. Note that the difference between respondents who care who wins the election and those who do not is greatest in the low media attention category for the other media, campaign/debate, and TV news indices. For the TV entertainment index,

turnout is lowest in the high frequency/don't care cell and highest in the low frequency/care cell. Citizens who care about the outcome and concentrate their political media attention on newspapers have high rates of turnout in contrast to those who don't care about the election outcome and get their major share of political news from television. To repeat, caring about the outcome and media attention both affect turnout; when the two variables work in conjunction with each other, both the highest and lowest rates of turnout are achieved.

Study after study have shown that citizens who feel politically efficacious are more likely to engage in political activity than those who do not feel efficacious (Campbell, et. a., pp. 103-105). In Table 4 we see that the efficacy and the media variables work together to enhance or to inhibit turnout. For three indices (other media, campaign/debate, and TV news) turnout is highest in the high efficacy/high media consumption category. For TV entertainment it is the high efficacy/low media attention cell that has the highest turnout rates. On the media concentration variable, those who concentrate on newspapers and are efficacious are the highest participants. As with the first set of relationships examined in Table 4, it is the conjoint influence of efficacy and media attention that has the greatest effects on turnout.

It has often been suggested that a high sense of citizen duty accounts for turnout in American elections (Campbell, et. al., pp. 105-106). Many citizens vote who have only a mild interest in election outcomes and are politically inefficacious. They vote, it is argued, because of an acquired sense that it is right and proper to vote, in fact that they have an obligation to do so. Table 4 has an item that measures citizen duty: should you vote (not vote) if you do not care about the outcome. The pattern is similar to that discussed above for concern and efficacy. Differences in turnout

rates between the high and low citizen duty respondents remain as do the media effects noted previously. For the first three indices highest rates of turnout are achieved in the high citizen duty/high media involvement category while lowest voting rates are obtained in the exact opposite cell. The high entertainment/low citizen duty category produces the lowest turnout with the highest rates obtained in the low frequency/high citizen duty cell. TV concentrates with a low sense of civic duty participate the least. A high sense of civic duty to vote in conjunction with high rates of media attention (or low entertainment watching) produces the highest rates of vote turnout.

Personal trust is a different variable from those just examined in that it has no manifest political content. In this instance, respondents are simply asked if "most people can be trusted?" Despite the lack of political content, nonetheless, we would expect the trusting person to vote in greater numbers than the distrustful, and that is what the data suggest (see the appendix). Why engage in a behavior if the electoral victors cannot be trusted because people cannot be trusted? The data support the conclusion that both personal trust and media use affect rates of turnout. The trust/high media use cell have very high rates of turnout for the other media, campaign/debate and TV news indices, while the trust/low entertainment category has a high turnout rate as well. Respondents who are personally trusting and concentrate their media attention on newspapers also rank high in voting.

Next we turn to the data on age. As can be observed in the appendix, the relationship between age and turnout is not linear; turnout is low in the youngest age group, increases in middle age and declines among the old, although never returning to the very low rates among the very young. This

is a similar pattern to that observed in numerous previous studies (see, for example, Campbell, et. al., p. 494). Given the four age categories and the three or four media categories for each index, the pattern is not as simple to describe as with previous control variables. We can say that the lowest turnout rates occur in the youngest age groups and those who rank low on the other media, campaign/debate, and TV news watching indices. Turnout is very low for the first two of these groups, in fact below 40 percent. Rates are also lowest for the young who rank high on the TV entertainment measure and for the 18 to 29 year olds who concentrate their political media attention on television. Apparently, the decline in turnout among the very old, noted in prior studies, is due to the portion of that group that rank very low in attention to other media and to campaign/debate watching. In conclusion, suffice it to say that the control for age did not wash out the media effects noted previously.

High levels of education have traditionally been associated with high rates of voting turnout (see the many citations in Milbrath and Goel). In Table 4 we see that both education and media affect turnout rates. Media effects seem greatest among those with the least education, while the effects of a college education seem greatest among those who rank low on the other media, campaign/debate and TV news indices. Education and the media working in conjunction affect turnout rates the most.

In summary, Table 4 has demonstrated that the media effects noted in the bivariate tables do not disappear when controls are instituted for concern for the election outcome, political efficacy, sense of citizen duty, personal trust, age and education. In fact the controls clarify and enhance the original relationships. In every instance the control variable and the media index work in concert to increase or decrease turnout.

Conclusions

Using data from the 1976 presidential election study, this paper has examined the effects on vote turnout of a number of variables that measure television viewing habits in a variety of areas (entertainment, news, political campaigns and TV debates) as well as other mass media variables such as radio, magazines, and newspapers. The effects vary depending on the particular television viewing habit: 1) turnout is highest for those who are heavy viewers of campaign programs and presidential debates; 2) turnout also goes up for heavy news viewers but the rates are lower than for the campaign/ debate watchers; 3) in contrast to the above, turnout decreases as entertainment viewing increases. Turnout is also high, approximating the campaign/debate watchers, for those who rank high in their attention to the other media: radio, magazines, and newspapers. Controlling these relationships for the effects of third variables did not wash out the effects of the media.

It is apparent that the broader measurement of television variables than is usually the case in studies of voting behavior was important in this particular research. It allowed us to differentiate types of television viewing in terms of political content: campaign/debate (pure political), news (mostly political), and entertainment (mostly non-political). As a result the findings showed that campaign/debate watching had a great impact on vote turnout. We have tried to explain this as resulting from the purely political content of such television exposure. At the other extreme is entertainment viewing where the political content is either minimal or non-existent and the result is lowered turnout.

And yet despite the importance of the findings presented here, the 1976 Michigan data set leaves a great deal to be desired for the student of television and political behavior. We really know very little about the

television viewing habits of Americans from this data set. Future research that wants to examine in more detail the impact of the "omnipresent tube" on the political behavior of the electorate will need to devise survey instruments that provide greater opportunities for such examination.

SOURCES

- Asher, Herbert B. Presidential Elections and American Politics. Revised ed. (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1980).
- Blumler, J.G., and McLeod, J.M. "Communication and Voter Turnout in Britain," in Sociological Theory and Survey Research, edited by T. Legatt (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1974), pp. 265-312.
- Campbell, Angus, et al. The American Voter (New York: John Wiley, 1960).
- Comstock, George, et. al. Television and Human Behavior (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968).
- Flanigan, William E., and Zingale, Nancy H. 4th ed. Political Behavior of the American Electorate (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1979).
- Gant, Michael M. "A Theory of Media Utilization in Election Campaigns" paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 19-21, 1979.
- Kraus, Sidney, and Davis, Dennis. The Effects of Mass Communication on Political Behavior (University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976).
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. et.al. The People's Choice (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1944).
- Milbrath, Lester, and Goel, M. Lal. Political Participation (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1977).
- Prieta, Robert H. "Mass Media Exposure and Political Behavior," Education Broadcasting Review. 7 (June, 1973), pp. 167-73.
- The Roper Organization, Inc. Changing Public Attitudes toward Television and other Mass Media: 1959-1976.

Table 1

1976 MEDIA VARIABLES-FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS

	<u>Many</u>	<u>Several</u>	<u>1 or 2</u>	<u>None</u>	
1. Follow Political Campaign on Radio: How Many Programs?	11.4% (271)	19.8% (469)	13.3% (316)	55.5% (1316)	
2. Follow Political Campaign in Magazines: How Many Articles?	12.2% (292)	20.1% (480)	15.8% (379)	51.9% (1242)	
3. Follow Political Campaign on Television: How Many Programs?	34.4% (817)	35.3% (839)	19.0% (476)	11.3% (268)	
4. Number of Presidential & Vice-Presidential Debates Watched	<u>3 or More</u> 46.5% (1104)	<u>2</u> 24.9% (592)	<u>1</u> 11.3% (268)	<u>0</u> 17.3% (410)	
5. Follow Political Campaign in Newspapers?	<u>Regularly</u> 24.9% (596)	<u>Often</u> 14.0% (334)	<u>Time to Time</u> 23.1% (552)	<u>Once in a while</u> 11.4% (272)	<u>Not at all</u> 26.7% (638)
6. Read about National Politics in Newspaper	<u>Frequently</u> 28.0% (670)	<u>Sometimes</u> 37.2% (889)	<u>Rarely</u> 20.0% (480)	<u>Never</u> 14.8% (354)	
7. Read about State/Local Politics in Newspaper	29.3% (701)	38.1% (912)	18.3% (437)	14.3% (343)	
8. Watch Daytime Entertainment Programs on Television	13.9% (335)	16.5% (397)	25.6% (614)	43.9% (1054)	
9. Watch Evening Entertainment Programs on Television	26.3% (629)	37.0% (887)	21.4% (514)	15.3% (367)	
10. Watch Early Evening News on Television	53.6% (1286)	23.6% (565)	13.6% (327)	9.2% (221)	
11. Watch Late Evening Local News on Television	47.0% (1126)	23.2% (556)	15.2% (364)	14.6% (350)	
12. Rely on Newspapers or Television for Political News	<u>Newspapers</u> 19.3% (448)	<u>Both</u> 16.5% (383)	<u>Television</u> 64.2% (1490)		

Table 2

1976 MEDIA VARIABLES AND VOTE TURNOUT

(Percents are those who turned out within media category)

	<u>Many</u>	<u>Several</u>	<u>1 or 2</u>	<u>None</u>	
1. Campaign on Radio	81.3%	80.8%	74.5%	65.8%	
2. Campaign in Magazines	89.6	83.3	76.4	61.4	
3. Campaign Television Watch	81.7	77.8	58.0	44.4	
4. Debates	<u>3 or more</u> 81.7	<u>2</u> 73.4	<u>1</u> 61.1	<u>0</u> 49.3	
5. Campaign in Newspapers	<u>Regularly</u> 86.7%	<u>Often</u> 85.9%	<u>Time to Time</u> 75.4%	<u>Once in a while</u> 61.1%	<u>Not at all</u> 50.9%
6. National Politics in Newspapers	<u>Frequently</u> 88.0%	<u>Sometimes</u> 77.2%	<u>Rarely</u> 57.8%	<u>Never</u> 45.0%	
7. State/Local Politics in Newspapers	87.6	76.6	58.5	42.8	
8. Daytime TV Entertainment	57.8	64.6	76.0	76.0	
9. Evening TV Entertainment	62.1	74.7	77.2	72.3	
10. Early Evening TV News	76.8	65.8	65.6	64.7	
11. Late Evening TV News	78.6	67.6	67.3	60.5	
12. Reliance on Newspapers/TV as Source of News	<u>Newspapers</u> 80.5%	<u>Both</u> 78.4%	<u>TV</u> 68.5%		

N's are identical to those in Table 1

Table 3

MEDIA INDICES BY VOTE TURNOUT

(Percents are those who voted)

	<u>Very High</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Very Low</u>
Other Media-Radio, Magazine and Newspaper Frequency	86.2% (311)	85.8% (669)	73.2% (723)	49.8% (701)
Campaign and Debate Watching Frequency	81.0% (1445)	65.9% (250)	69.6% (196)	48.2% (511)
	<u>High</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Low</u>	
TV News Watching Frequency	76.1% (1398)	65.3% (453)	62.1% (264)	
TV Entertainment Watching Frequency	60.1% (532)	73.0% (1190)	78.0% (681)	

Table 4

MEDIA INDICES BY TURNOUT CONTROLLING FOR
THIRD VARIABLES

Media Indices		SALIENCE		EFFICACY		CITIZEN DUTY	
		Care Which Party Wins		Politics Complex		Should Not Vote Unless Care	
		Care	Don't Care	Non Efficacious	Efficacious	Agree	Disagree
1. Other Media: Radio, Magazines, Newspapers	HIGH	87.8% (198)	81.4% (102)	85.2% (159)	87.9% (149)	80.2% (101)	89.5% (206)
		89.3% (425)	80.2% (230)	83.3% (412)	91.6% (245)	79.0% (255)	90.6% (399)
		78.8% (420)	66.3% (273)	70.0% (545)	84.2% (171)	66.5% (339)	79.8% (369)
	↓	51.8% (296)	41.3% (378)	48.4% (595)	59.1% (77)	40.7% (378)	62.0% (296)
	LOW						
2. Campaign/Debate Watching on TV	HIGH	84.6% (905)	76.4% (493)	77.4% (954)	88.6% (474)	75.0% (595)	86.1% (822)
		70.6% (114)	62.3% (129)	64.5% (204)	72.8% (41)	59.9% (119)	71.0% (126)
		76.4% (108)	58.3% (82)	66.5% (138)	84.3% (51)	58.1% (93)	81.1% (101)
	↓	64.9% (207)	36.0% (280)	45.1% (415)	67.8% (75)	34.1% (267)	65.2% (220)
	LOW						
3. TV News Watching	HIGH	81.8% (838)	67.6% (518)	72.3% (961)	86.9% (412)	67.5% (582)	82.3% (787)
		73.3% (232)	57.7% (196)	61.4% (341)	79.9% (100)	55.2% (217)	76.4% (227)
	↓	73.2% (123)	51.9% (132)	55.2% (197)	83.9% (59)	50.2% (138)	80.2% (114)
	LOW						
4. TV Entertainment Watching	HIGH	67.9% (310)	49.4% (206)	57.4% (411)	73.2% (99)	51.0% (268)	70.1% (245)
		81.4% (648)	63.9% (495)	67.9% (867)	87.9% (307)	62.8% (524)	81.8% (641)
	↓	86.5% (381)	66.2% (283)	75.0% (433)	85.8% (236)	69.9% (282)	85.3% (384)
	LOW						
5. Media - Newspapers		85.2% (505)	71.5% (288)	73.8% (511)	90.0% (310)	69.6% (320)	86.7% (490)
Concentration - TV		76.5% (802)	59.4% (650)	65.5% (1135)	80.6% (322)	59.8% (704)	77.0% (757)

Table 4 (continued)

PERSONAL TRUST

Can People be Trusted?

<u>Media Indices</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
1. Other Media: Radio, Magazines, Newspapers	HIGH	89.4% (204)	82.0% (103)
	↓	91.7% (388)	78.1% (267)
	↓	79.2% (370)	67.0% (338)
	LOW	56.6% (271)	44.6% (395)
2. Campaign/Debate Watching on TV	HIGH	87.4% (811)	72.8% (607)
	↓	68.4% (138)	64.1% (103)
	↓	76.1% (90)	68.0% (99)
	LOW	58.0% (193)	40.6% (293)
3. TV News Watching	HIGH	84.1% (753)	66.5% (617)
	↓	76.6% (216)	56.0% (223)
	↓	69.1% (117)	56.6% (134)
	LOW		
4. TV Entertainment Watching	HIGH	70.7% (214)	54.0% (308)
	↓	81.4% (636)	63.5% (524)
	↓	82.3% (382)	72.3% (271)
	LOW		
5. Media Con- centration	NEWSPAPERS	86.2% (488)	70.3% (320)
	TV	76.6% (714)	61.4% (735)

Table 4 (continued)

Media Indices		Age				Education		
		18-29	30-44	45-59	60+	< High School Grad	High School Grad	At Least Some College
1. Other Media: Radio, Magazines, Newspapers	High	78.2% (74)	86.9% (77)	88.3% (86)	92.0% (69)	87.5% (32)	84.6% (98)	87.5% (180)
		74.7 (152)	88.9 (180)	91.5 (153)	87.1 (182)	75.9 (137)	85.1 (219)	90.6 (313)
		67.2 (191)	77.0 (185)	76.7 (148)	72.7 (198)	61.7 (231)	72.6 (265)	86.3 (226)
	Low	38.7 (256)	51.7 (144)	65.4 (135)	52.0 (161)	46.2 (325)	48.3 (259)	62.8 (112)
2. Campaign/ Debate Watching on TV	High	74.5 (324)	84.4 (347)	84.0 (360)	80.2 (405)	69.8 (392)	80.6 (475)	89.3 (577)
		50.0 (95)	69.2 (73)	81.9 (36)	81.3 (46)	51.7 (73)	63.3 (94)	81.0 (82)
		58.7 (61)	72.2 (54)	81.2 (43)	72.6 (37)	58.7 (52)	72.4 (73)	76.4 (70)
	Low	38.2 (193)	54.5 (111)	61.2 (83)	50.0 (121)	39.4 (207)	45.8 (199)	70.0 (102)
3. TV News Watching	High	66.7 (344)	76.4 (303)	81.0 (343)	79.5 (398)	66.2 (420)	73.4 (495)	87.9 (477)
		55.5 (115)	71.1 (95)	76.3 (97)	62.4 (141)	49.1 (175)	72.1 (138)	79.5 (139)
		50.7 (105)	71.1 (75)	78.3 (35)	61.4 (51)	47.3 (83)	51.7 (87)	84.7 (95)
	Low							
4. TV Entertain- ment watching	High	47.0 (159)	63.9 (110)	67.5 (97)	65.5 (164)	50.0 (227)	61.6 (193)	78.3 (111)
		62.5 (346)	74.5 (306)	82.5 (277)	75.0 (255)	59.5 (345)	71.6 (453)	86.7 (388)
		64.0 (168)	85.6 (170)	83.7 (148)	79.6 (191)	69.1 (154)	73.5 (194)	85.2 (332)
	Low							
5. Media Concentration	Newspapers	64.7 (203)	84.9 (208)	86.8 (178)	81.7 (238)	64.4 (177)	78.6 (281)	87.8 (372)
	TV	57.9 (459)	71.6 (353)	77.8 (325)	71.0 (344)	58.6 (507)	66.6 (538)	82.4 (439)

Appendix A1

SOCIAL DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS BY VOTE TURNOUT

<u>Items</u>	<u>Turnout</u>	<u>N</u>
1. Sex: Male	76.9%	991
Female	67.8	1412
2. Race: White	72.5	2106
Black	65.1	219
3. Age: 18-29	59.2	672
30-44	75.7	585
45-59	80.0	521
60 +	73.9	610
4. Education: Less than High School	58.6	725
High School	69.7	840
At least some college	85.0	831
5. Subjective Social Class: Working	64.0	1002
Upper Working	72.2	213
Middle	78.2	820
Upper Middle	82.3	277
6. Income: Under \$5000	56.5	420
5-10	67.2	494
10-15	71.5	521
15-25	78.9	549
25+	88.7	258
7. Employed: Yes	75.2	1280
No	67.7	1092

Appendix A2

SALIENCE BY VOTE TURNOUT

<u>Items</u>	<u>Most</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Now & Then</u>	<u>Hardly at all</u>			
1. Follow public affairs	86.0% (908)	77.4% (754)	54.3% (439)	38.4% (287)			
	<u>Strong Dem.</u>	<u>Weak Dem.</u>	<u>Inde. Dem.</u>	<u>Inde. Rep.</u>	<u>Weak Rep.</u>	<u>Strong Rep.</u>	
2. Party Identification	80.9% (339)	68.0% (583)	72.1% (280)	56.6% (342)	73.6% (245)	73.7% (354)	92.1% (222)
3. Care who wins the election	<u>Care</u> 79.7% (1338)	<u>Don't Care</u> 61.5% (983)					
	<u>Very much</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not Much</u>				
4. Interest in the Campaign	84% (902)	71.9% (1014)	47.2% (475)				

Appendix A3

CITIZEN DUTY BY VOTE TURNOUT

<u>Items</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>
1. Vote unimportant if can't win	46.1% (192)	74.8% (2170)
2. Vote unimportant if many vote	28.8% (226)	76.8% (2141)
3. Should not vote unless care	61.1% (1073)	80.6% (1270)
4. Local elections unimportant	46.9% (311)	76.6% (2031)

Appendix A4

LOCAL AND NATIONAL EFFICACY BY VOTE TURNOUT

<u>Items</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>National</u>	
	<u>Non</u> <u>Efficacious</u>	<u>Efficacious</u>	<u>Non</u> <u>Efficacious</u>	<u>Efficacious</u>
1. R. has no say in government	59.2% (781)	77.9% (1594)	62.1% (983)	79.8% (1348)
2. Voting only way for citizen to have say	----	----	68.5 (1314)	78.5 (1012)
3. Government too complex to understand	61.2 (1210)	82.4 (1168)	67.2 (1710)	84.9 (641)
4. Officials don't care about people like me	----	----	63.9 (1226)	82.2 (1057)
5. Politicians lose touch with people	63.5 (1130)	79.6 (1230)	69.8 (1631)	81.7 (632)
6. Parties interested in votes not opinions	----	----	67.9 (1437)	81.4 (821)

Appendix A5

GOVERNMENT RESPONSIVENESS BY VOTE TURNOUT

<u>Items</u>	<u>Good deal</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>Not much</u>
1. Government listens to people	76.8% (253)	75.7% (1303)	65.3% (783)
2. Parties effective	82.0 (414)	73.0 (1261)	65.5 (621)
3. Elections effective	77.9 (1241)	69.6 (852)	58.5 (247)
4. Congressmen attentive	74.9 (434)	75.3 (1344)	64.6 (525)

Appendix A6

PERSONAL TRUST BY VOTE TURNOUT

<u>Items</u>	<u>Trust</u>	<u>Distrust</u>
1. Most people can be trusted	79.9% (1232)	63.0% (1103)
2. Most people take advantage	77.6 (1431)	62.2 (848)
3. Most people try to be helpful	79.8 (1242)	62.4 (1049)